Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of July 18, in which claim 1 was rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,385,182 to Dyer.

Claim 1 has been amended for the purpose of clarity and to particularly recite that the resilient member comprises a beam having a plurality of bends at locations spaced from said connection component. This recitation is clearly supported in the figures and at paragraph 14 as originally filed. The plurality of bends are advantageous as these bends help in spring biasing the spout against the side wall of the fuel inlet, when the device is in use, as disclosed at paragraph 20.

United States Patent No. 5,385,182 to Dyer shows a beam attached to the nozzle and extending straight to a hook at an end thereof. There is no teaching or suggestion of a plurality of bends at locations spaced from the connection component. In fact, Dyer does not contemplate spring biasing this spout against the side wall of the fuel inlet. Instead, Dyer provides only a device with a hook on the end to latch on to the tank.

It is therefore believed that amended claim 1 fully distinguishes over the cited reference.

Claim 4, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable, has been rewritten in independent form.

Claim 8 has been amended to include limitations similar to those included in amended claim 1. It is therefore believed that this claim fully distinguishes over the cited reference.

Claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of former claim 8.

Claim 16 has been amended for the purpose of clarity.

Claims 9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended to correct claim dependencies.

We believe that the claims now presented are patentable over the prior art of record, and that the application is in proper form for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-8900

October 13, 2005